

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-2, 6-7, and 11-12 have been cancelled. Claims 3-4, 8-9, and 13-15 have been amended, without acquiescence or prejudice to pursue the original claims in a related application. Claims 16-24 are new. No new matter has been added.

I. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating claims 3, 8 and 13 contain allowable subject matter, and are allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and the minor informalities objections.

II. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

1. Claims 1, 6, and 11 and their respective dependent claims have been objected to because the claims allegedly are missing essential functional/structural relationships among the elements because flattened should be inserted before parameterized. Without acquiescence to the stated reasons for the objection, claims 1, 6 and 11 have been cancelled. Applicants respectfully submit that the term “flattening” relates to the hierarchy of the parameterized cell and is therefore properly placed before the term “hierarchy”. An example of flattening a hierarchy of a parameterized cell is provided in the Specification at paragraph [0021]. Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the dependent claims of 1, 6, and 11 be withdrawn.

2. Claim 13 has been objected to because the claim allegedly needs greater clarity. Without acquiescence to the stated reasons for the objection, claim 13 has been amended. Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claim 13 and its respective dependent claims be withdrawn.

3. Claim 14 has been objected to because the claim allegedly needs greater clarity. Without acquiescence to the stated reasons for the objection, claim 14 has been amended. Applicants

respectfully request that the objections to claim 14 and its respective dependent claims be withdrawn.

4. Claim 15 has been objected to because the claim allegedly needs greater clarity. Without acquiescence to the stated reasons for the objection, claim 15 has been amended. Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claim 15 and its respective dependent claims be withdrawn.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention allegedly lacks patentable utility. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 3, 8, and 13, and their dependent claims provide a useful, concrete and tangible result. An example of a useful, concrete and tangible result is the limitation “storing a physical design quantization characteristic value” in independent claims 3, 8, and 13. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections to claims 3, 8, and 13 and their respective dependent claims be withdrawn.

III. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by McGaughy, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0149312 (“McGaughy”).

As discussed above, claims 1-2, 6-7, and 11-12 have been cancelled. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable because the claims have been rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims in the interest of expediting an early allowance thereby rendering moot the rejection of these claims. Because claims 4-5, 9-10, and 14-15 depend from claims 3, 8, and 13, the claims are likewise allowable.


CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-4047, referencing billing number **7020002001**. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-4047, referencing billing number **7020002001**.

Respectfully submitted,
Bingham McCutchen LLP

By: 

Peter C. Mei
Reg. No. 39,768

Date: June 13, 2007

Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (650) 849-4870
Facsimile: (650) 849-4800